Case 2:24-cv-01844-DJC-AC Document	26 Filed 01/27/25 Page 1 of 4
FOR THE EASTERN D	ATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SACRAME	NTO DIVISION
	<u></u>
JANE DOE #2,	2:24-cv-1844 DJC AC P
V.  MARCUS JOHNSON, et al.,  Defendants	DEFENDANTS GONZALEZ, MACOMBER, AND MONTES TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT  [PROPOSED] ORDER
	Judge: Hon. Allison Claire Trial Date: None set Action Filed: July 1, 2024
CONT.	
	ULATION
	ure 6(b), the parties, by and through their attorneys
of record, stipulate as follows:	
1. Plaintiff Jane Doe #2 filed her oper	rative First Amended Complaint on November 21,
2024 (ECF No. 20).	
2. On December 6, 2024, the Court is	ssued its screening order regarding the Second
Amended Complaint and ordered Defendants I	L. Gonzalez, J. Macomber, and R. Montes

1

8

6

12

11

14 15

13

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

(Defendants)<sup>1</sup> to respond to the First Amended Complaint within 21 days of the filing of the order, making Defendants' initial deadline December 27, 2024 (ECF No. 21).

- 3. On December 26, 2024, the Court granted the parties' stipulated request to extend the time for Defendants to respond to the Second Amended Complaint until January 24, 2025. (ECF No. 24).
- 4. Since that extension, the parties have met and conferred regarding the claims and allegations in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint and grounds for a motion to dismiss by Defendants, including but not limited to, a challenge to Plaintiff's standing to pursue injunctive relief and whether Plaintiff complied with the California Government Claims Act. Specifically, Defendants' counsel prepared and sent a letter to Plaintiff's counsel on January 17, 2025, outlining arguments for dismissal and the parties then conferred via video-conference on these grounds on January 22, 2025. In addition, the parties are currently considering whether to pursue early ADR, and Defendants have agreed to provide some documents under a protective order to Plaintiff so that the parties may more fully evaluate Plaintiff's claims. Accordingly, additional time to respond to the operative complaint is warranted to allow this exchange of information, including the preparation and entry of a protective order; for additional discussion of the viability of Plaintiff's claims against Defendants; and for the parties to more fully consider whether early ADR is appropriate for this matter.
- 5. In addition, Defendants' counsel has been occupied with other matters. Mr. Mark was out of the office from December 30, 2024 to January 10, 2025. During Mr. Mark's absence, Mr. Glantz was required to work on other pressing matters, including reviewing and responding to seven motions for remand in seven separate matters. And Mr. Glantz has been working to respond to an administrative subpoena in a matter involving the United States Department of Justice, which response is currently due January 24, 2025.
- 6. The parties have conferred and agree that additional time to respond to the First Amended Complaint until February 28, 2025, will allow the parties time to exchange documents,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The undersigned counsel does not represent Defendant Johnson.

	Case 2:24-cv-01844-DJC-AC Document 26 Filed 01/27/25 Page 4 of 4
1	<del>[PROPOSED]</del> ORDER
2	Good cause appearing, the parties' stipulation is <b>GRANTED</b> . The deadline for Defendants
3	Gonzalez, Macomber, and Montes to respond to Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint is hereby
4	extended up to and including February 28, 2025.
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.
6	DATED: January 24, 2025
7	ALLISON CLAIRE
8	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13 14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
) Ω	

4